COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XII. No. 19.] LONDON, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1807. [PRICE 10D.

Ye friends to truth, ye statesmen, who survey
The rich man's joys increase, the poor's decay,
'Tis yours to judge, how wide the limits stand
Between a splendid and a happy land.
Proud swells the tide with loads of freighted ore,
And shouting folly hails them from her shore;
Hoards, e'en beyond the miser's wish, abound,
And rich men flock from all the world around.
Yet count our gains. This wealth is but a name,
That leaves our useful products still the same.
Not so the loss. The man of wealth and pride
Takes up a space that many poor supplied;
Space for his lake, his park's extended bounds,
Space for his horses, equipage and hounds;
The robe that wraps his limbs in silken sloth,
Has robb'd the neighb'r'ng fields of half their growth;
His seat, where solitary sports are seen,
Indignant spurns the cottage from the green;
Around the world each needful product flies,
For all the luxuries the world supplies:
While thus the land, adorn'd for pleasure all,
In barren splendour feebly waits the fall.

GOLDSMITH.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

SPENCE ON COMMERCE.——A pamphlet has been published by a Mr. William Spence, entitled, "Britain Independent "of Commerce," the object of which pamphlet, is, to prove, from an investigation into the true causes of the wealth of nations, that our riches, prosperity, and power are derived from resources inherent in ourselves, and would not be affected, even though our commerce were annihilated. —— This is certainly a very important subject, and, as I find the leisure, I shall notice every part of the pamphlet. At present I shall content myself with noticing what this writer says in support of his opinion as to the real source of national wealth; first adverting, however, to the motives, which induced him to undertake the work, which motives, the reader will perceive, were of the most disinterested and benevolent kind. ——Mr. Spence, after describing how much alarm is experienced, by the nation at large, at the idea of our being ruined by the loss of our commerce says:——"The author of "these pages has long been satisfied, that "the importance of our commerce, has "been greatly overrated; he has long in- "deed been convinced, that the *wealth* "we derive from it is nothing; that the "utility of by far the greater part of it, is "to be resolved into its power of procur- "ing for us certain luxuries, which we "could do very well without, and in ex- "change for which we give much more "valuable necessaries; and consequently, "that our riches, our greatness, and our "happiness, are independent of it. These "convictions, however *singular* and *uncon- "formable to the public voice*, have been "sources of great mental gratification to "him. Whilst his fellow countrymen have "heard the news of the shutting up of a "port against us with terror and dismay, "and have regarded our exclusion from "commerce with Hamburgh, with Holland, "and with Italy, as the almost sure pre- "cursor of national ruin, he, persuaded of "the fallacy of these fears, has looked up- "on these events with indifference; and "has rather been inclined to pity the poor "inhabitants of the countries, who are "prevented from buying our manufactures, "than us that are hindered from selling "them.——Such being his sentiments, he "is desirous of laying the grounds of them "before the public; to the end, that tried "by such a touchstone, their truth, or "their error, may be made apparent; wish- "ing, if the former, that the diffusion of "just ideas, on an important subject, may "lead his countrymen to more manly views "of their independence; and if the latter, "that his own erroneous notions may be "rectified, and that no longer buoyed up, "by the delusions of indifference, he may "sympathize with the hopes and fears of "his fellow men."——Nothing, surely, can be more worthy of praise than such a motive as this. Mr. Spence, though he no where throws out even a hint, that the taxes are too heavy, and does, indeed, seem to think, that the labouring part of the nation are no more useful than the French valets and Italian singers, appears, from the above extract, to be a very compassionate gentleman; and, therefore, it will certainly give him great satisfaction to hear, that the public, properly so called, are not in so much anxiety as he supposes with respect to colonies and commerce; and that, though "ninety nine out of every hundred persons" whom *he* has met with, look upon our greatness as dependent upon our commerce, more than one half of the persons, that *I* meet with, are of a contrary opinion; and

that, as to *myself*, it would be strange indeed, if I entertained any dread of the effects of a diminished commerce, seeing, that I have frequently, I may say hundreds of times, and in almost the very words of Mr. Spence, expressed my conviction, that this nation derived from commerce neither wealth nor power. Nay, there is scarcely any one sentiment, relating to the main object of his work, which sentiment the readers of the Register have not heard from me; and, as Mr. Spence would hardly have taken such pains to premise that he was the *first* to promulgate these sentiments, if he had read the Register, I cannot help considering it as a high compliment to myself that a person so clever, as he appears to be (notwithstanding he has had the weakness to put F. L. S. at the end of his name), should not only concur with me in sentiments upon this important subject, but should have chosen almost the same form of words, wherein to convey those sentiments to the world.——Being, at this moment, at a distance from my books, I cannot refer to the precise pages, from a comparison between which and the pages of Mr. Spence this striking concurrence would be made apparent; and, therefore, I shall now just quote the passage, wherein he gives his description of the real source of national wealth, which passage I earnestly recommend to the attentive perusal of my readers.

——" That the examination into the truth " of the opinion, that agriculture is the only " source of wealth, may be rendered as simple as possible, let us inquire what would " take place in a country constituted much " in the same way as this country is; where " there should be a class of land proprietors, a class of farmers, and a class of " manufacturers, but where there should " exist no money of any kind, no gold, silver, or paper, in fact, no circulating medium whatever. In such a society, the " land proprietor must receive his rent in " kind, in corn, cattle, or whatever may be " the produce of his land; and all transactions between man and man, must be carried on by the medium of barter. However inconvenient such a state of society " might be, it may be very well conceived " to exist, and has, indeed, existed in a great " degree, at one period, even in our own " country. In a nation so circumstanced, " though part of the subsistence of the manufacturing class would be drawn from " the farmer, from the profit which would " remain with him after the maintenance " of his family, and the rent of his landlord were deducted, yet by far the largest " portion of their subsistence, it is evident, " must be drawn from the class of land proprietors; from that surplus produce paid " to them under the denomination of rent. " It will therefore in a still greater degree " simplify our illustration, if we suppose, " what will in no respect influence the accuracy of our reasoning, that the *whole* of " the subsistence of the manufacturing class " must be derived from the class of land " proprietors.——From this system results " such as the following would ensue: the " competition which would necessarily take " place amongst the class of manufacturers, " to dispose of their articles to the land proprietors, would restrict the price of these " articles, as is the case at present, to a " quantity of provisions barely necessary to " replace the subsistence of the manufacturer, whilst he had been employed on " them. This being the case, all the articles which the manufacturer might fabricate in the course of a year, would by the " end of that year, be in possession of " the land proprietors, in exchange for provision. All the food which the class of " land proprietors had to dispose of, would, " by the industry of the class of manufacturers, be transmuted into various articles " of use, or of luxury; and these remaining and accumulating with the former " class, it would in time heap up great " wealth, by this successive and constant " transformation of its riches. None of " this wealth, however, could with truth be " said to have been *brought into existence* " by the manufacturer, for as the land proprietor had given in exchange for the produce of the manufacturer's labour, an " equal value in food, which no longer remained in existence, all the merit which " could justly be conceded to him, would " be his having transmuted wealth of so perishable a nature as food, into the more " durable wealth manufactures.——But it " may be asked, would not the master manufacturer draw from the land proprietor, " as the price of his articles, a greater quantity of food, than he had advanced to his " labouring manufacturers employed in " their fabrication? We may grant, that " this would be the case, still, whatever " might be the amount of this surplus, even " were it considerably more than was necessary for his own subsistence, no wealth " would be *brought into existence* by his " profit. The master manufacturer might " indeed acquire riches, by an accumulation " of such profits, yet the whole of his gains " would be *at the expense of the land proprietors*, and *no addition would be made to*

" *the national wealth.* An example will " demonstrate this: if a coachmaker were " to employ so many men for half a year in " the building of a coach, as that for their " subsistence during that time, he had ad- " vanced fifty quarters of corn, and if we " suppose he sold this coach to a land pro- " prietor for sixty quarters of corn, it is evi- " dent, that the coachmaker would be ten " quarters of corn richer, than if he had sold " it for fifty quarters, its original cost. But " it is equally clear, that the *land proprietor* " *would be ten quarters of corn poorer*, than " if he had bought his coach at its prime " cost. A *transfer*, then, not a *creation* of " wealth, has taken place, whatever one " gains, the other loses, and the *national* " *wealth is just the same.* This illustrative " example will apply to every imagina- " able case, of the sale of manufactures fa- " bricated and sold in our supposed society, " however complex the operations they " might pass through, or how many soever " the number of hands employed on them. " In every instance, their price would re- " solve itself into the amount of the food " consumed during their fabrication, by the " labouring manufacturer, and into the pro- " fit of the master manufacturer; the for- " mer, we have shewn, is merely a con- " version of one sort of wealth into another " sort of the same value, and the latter is in " every case a transfer of wealth, merely " from the pocket of the buyer to that of " the seller.——It may be inquired, by " those who are so dazzled by the wealth " gained by the manufacturer in this coun- " try, would he, on such a system as we " have imagined, acquire wealth as he does " now? For if he did not, if all the wealth " of the country remained with the land " proprietor, this supposed state of society " would be very different from the one we " witness, where so many manufacturers " are rich, and so many proprietors of land " poor. This query has been in part an- " swered already, as the admission has been " made, that the master manufacturer would " demand a profit on the articles he had " caused to be fabricated, and it is clear, " that by an accumulation of these profits, " he would acquire wealth. At the same " time, it is not difficult to perceive, that " in a society without a circulating medium, " as in a society with one, many of the class " of land proprietors would be always poor. " There would be found there, men, whose " love of grandeur and of pleasure would " lead them to spend every grain of their " income in kind, as there are men found " here, whom the same motives cause to " spend every guinea of their revenue in " money.——If the foregoing observations " have convincingly shewn, that in a state " of society in which every transaction should " be carried on by barter, all the wealth of " such a nation would be created by agri- " culture, none by manufactures, there will " not be need of further argument, to prove " to the philosophical inquirer, that the very " same results must take place in a society " where a circulating medium is made use " of. Yet, as there is an idea prevalent, " that the employment of a circulating me- " dium materially affects the creation of a " national wealth, it will not be amiss to " examine this subject a little further.—— " The circulating medium of civilised na- " tions is either gold and silver, or paper. " Gold and silver are undoubtedly wealth, " yet they are but a small portion of what " has properly a claim to that title; and a " nation, which has abundance of gold and " silver, is, in fact, not richer than if it had " none. It has paid an equal value of some " other wealth for them, and there is no " good reason why it should be desirous of " having this, rather than any other spe- " cies of wealth: for the only superiority " in value which the precious metals possess " over other products of the labour of man, " is their fitness for being the instruments of " circulation and exchange. But in this " point of view, the necessity of having " gold or silver no longer exists. Experience " has in modern times evinced, that paper, " or the promissory notes of men of un- " doubted property, form a circulating me- " dium, fully as useful, and much less ex- " pensive. No one will pretend to say, that " the wealth of Great Britain consists of " gold and silver, because every one knows, " that these metals do not form a tythe of " her circulating medium; yet multitudes " will maintain, that this circulating me- " dium, composed chiefly of paper, *is a* " *portion of national wealth.* No position, " however, can be more false than this If " gold and silver be but the representative of " wealth, much more is all the paper in cir- " culation but the representative of wealth, " the shadow, not the substance, nay, in ma- " ny cases, it is the representative of nothing " —the shadow of a shade. When the " Bank of England coins a million of pounds " worth of notes, does it issue them with- " out receiving an equal value for them, or, at " any rate, without having security for the " amount? And when a swindling country " banker, without fortune, has persuaded the " surrounding country to take his notes in " exchange for real property, do not his

" deluded customers find, to their cost, that " these notes are *not wealth*, but merely " the representative of the *wealth of which* " *they have been duped?* If all these who " have any paper-money in possession, were " to demand to be paid its value, would " they be content to be paid *in other paper?* " would they not say, give us gold or silver, " or if you have not these, divide your pro- " perty, your land, your houses, your merchan- " dize, amongst us?——Thus, then, what- " ever is the circulating medium, whether it " be gold and silver, or paper, or both, being " but the representative of wealth, there " can be no difference, as to the *sources of* " *wealth*, between a nation which has, and " one which has not, a circulating medium: " and consequently wealth can be created " by the same branch of industry only, in " one as in the other. Whether the manu- " facturer receive the price of his manufac- " ture in food, or in money, with which " he purchases food; whether he sell his " articles directly to the land-proprietors, or " to any other class in society; whatever " be the complexity of transactions, re- " sulting from the intricacy consequent " upon a circulating medium; if the whole " be fairly analized, and every thing traced " to its source, it will in every case be " found, in the most refined, as in the " most barbarous, state of society, *that* " *agriculture is the great source, manufac-* " *tures no source at all, of national wealth.*" ——Now, though we have here nothing more than an illustration of principles, which I have, for years, been endeavouring to inculcate; though Mr. Spence (without knowing it, I dare say) is nothing more than the manufacturer, or transmuter, of the wealth (as he, at least, must suppose it) which I have, at different times created, this illustration, or transmutation, call it which we will, is very ably executed, and certainly discovers ingenuity, as well as solidity, rarely to be met with.——I have always regarded taxes as the " *fruit* of the *land* " and the *labour*," that is to say, of agriculture; I have always, since I have reflected upon such matters, insisted, that it was perfect nonsense to talk of the fall of the country, proceeding from what is called " national credit;" I have laughed at the idea of the property, or wealth of the nation being destroyed by the burning of bank-notes and dividend certificates; and, for all this most grossly have I been abused, having, more than once, brought upon myself, by the promulgation of these sentiments, the charge, the heinous charge of being a Jacobin and Leveller.——Though I do not intend to enter, at present, into any further examination of, or commentary upon, Mr. Spence's pamphlet, I cannot help noticing a distinction, which he appears to make between the Bank of England people and the Country Bankers, the latter of whom, when they have not real money, or goods or lands or houses, to answer the amount of their notes, he denominates " *swindlers*," and asks, whether those, who happened to hold any of the paper of these " swindlers," would be " contented, to receive payment in " *other paper*." Now, whether Mr. Spence meant, under this supposed case, to give us his opinion upon the grand transaction of the bank of England, at the time when that famous act, ironically " called the Bank-*Restriction*" act, was passed, I shall not pretend to say; but, certain it is, that the holders of about eleven millions' worth of the paper-money of that bank, were, when they called for real money, or for goods, in lieu of their paper, compelled, by law, to receive " *other paper* " in payment. The ground, then, for this distinction between the Bank of England and a " swindling" Country Banker, I must leave for Mr. Spence, in some future edition of his pamphlet, to explain; but, I beg leave to say before-hand, that, for my part, I shall not be satisfied with any distinction founded upon the funny act of " *restriction*," which, Mr. Spence will have the goodness to remember, was a *law made after the fact*, and was, in its principle, just the same as a law would be, which should be passed to-day for absolving me from the payment of a debt, which I, for value received, had contracted seven years ago.——I cannot dismiss this subject, even for the present, without a remark or two as to the effects, which would naturally be produced by Mr. Spence's and my principles becoming prevalent. People would re-think their former thoughts, or, rather, re-examine them. The song, which derived " the *roast beef* of Old England" from " our *commerce* and *arts*," would, doubtless, undergo a correction, and the popular parasites of the play-houses would be hissed off, unless they derived the said roast beef from the " *spade* and the *plough*." To introduce an old song into remarks upon so sober a subject may, at first sight, savour of levity; but, the sentiment being found in a popular national song, of long standing, shews in as strong a light, perhaps, as any thing can do, the prevalence of that sentiment; and, I think, it may be safely asserted, that a more absurd sentiment never did prevail in the world; for, where,

amongst what people, however savage or senseless, was it ever before supposed, that commerce and arts produced the flesh of the ox? To depict credulity in its most despicable degree, we say, that such an one is to be persuaded, that "the moon is made "of green cheese;" but, can such a man be regarded as more credulous than he who believes, that our beef is brought to us in ships, or made in a manufactory? The truth is, that the mass of people of this country, like those of every other country, have looked not beyond *immediate* causes. They saw that commerce and arts produced the means of *purchasing* the "smoaking "hot surloin;" and, without reflecting, as Mr. Spence has done, that purchasing was not *creating*, that, whatever beef was eaten by the commerce and arts, was taken away from the agriculture, and that the commerce and arts made *no addition* to the national wealth, they hastily concluded, that the commerce and arts were the *cause* of the surloin, and that, therefore, while the commerce and arts continued to flourish, we might safely set the French at defiance, leaving them to burst with *envy*, "like the "frog in the fable." Such has been the political philosophy of the nation; and, absurd as it is, it was the political philosophy of Pitt, whose eternal larum always ran upon the vital importance of commerce and manufactures; who pulled out his custom-house accounts as authorities whereon to argue in proof of an increase of national power; seventeen of whose bragging speeches conclude with the words "*our com-* "*mercial greatness;*" and whose opponents, proceeding upon the sentiment of the old roast-beef song, disputed, not his principles, but his custom-house detail; not his political philosophy, but the moral veracity of himself and his underlings. If Mr. Spence, or, which is more probable, if *events*, should teach the people of England to think rightly upon such matters; if they should, no matter from what cause, become convinced, that commerce and arts make no addition to the national means either of defence or of greatness; that the colonies, particularly in the East, so far from adding to the resources of the nation, are a heavy drain upon the fruit of the land and the labour; and, that the great tendency of the commercial system is to draw the real wealth of the whole country towards the metropolis, there, upon the labour of the working classes, to maintain, in idleness and luxury, innumerable swarms of place-men, pensioners, tax-gatherers, jews, jobbers, singers, parasites, and buffoons, while, at the same time, its financial operations render nine men out of ten either directly or indirectly dependant upon the minister of the day, which dependents have, again, their dependents, in the shape of parish paupers, who are daily and hourly increasing, and must continue to increase, in numbers and in misery; if the people in general should become convinced that such is the nature and tendency of the commercial system, then, and not till then, shall we see a prospect of the restoration of our declining, our falling, country.——But, what a terrible revolution would this make! The speeches of Pitt would sink into contempt, cheek by jowl with the old roast-beef song; all Lord Auckland's fine custom-house exhibitions would become matter for profane mirth; the jews would no longer see royal visitants, and their lovely progeny might be destined to resume the orange basket. Ah! Mr. Spence, you are certainly a Jacobin and Leveller! In vain would you, in some parts of your pamphlet, affect to be contented with the present state of things, and even attempt to prove to us, that the idle man is as useful as the labourer. Your principles, your good solid politico-economical principles, are at open war with this Panglosian philosophy; and, if we should, all of us, once imbibe those principles, we shall not listen to your philosophy.

Louis XVIII.——By the sudden, and unexpected appearance of this person, the "present confidential servants of his Ma- "jesty" seem to have been, and yet to be, sadly perplexed; placed, as the saying is, between hawk and buzzard.——It appears, from what has been published, with a half-official air, that Louis XVIII gave no intimation of his intention to come to England; that, being arrived at Yarmouth, he received information from the confidential servants of his Majesty, vulgarly called ministers, that Holyrood House, at Edinburgh, was prepared for his reception; that he declined the honour of a residence there, and informed the ministers, that his visit was of a *political* nature; whence it is inferred, that he is come to propose to the king, our gracious sovereign, openly to espouse his cause, to acknowledge him as King of France, and to make use of some means or other, if possible, to seat him upon the throne of his ancestors. This inference is so absurd, that I cannot believe it; and, I shall be much deceived, if it do not finally appear, that the fugitive prince, well apprized of the sort of life he must lead at Holyrood House, and looking upon the

choice of that place as a sort of banishment from England and the court, resolved not to go thither.——But, now let us hear the demi-official publication, which, after having said what has been, in substance, stated above, proceeds thus: "If he consent to "reside among us, *in a manner becoming* "*his present circumstances*, every substan- "tial consolation of a secure asylum and "*honourable* support, will be amply pro- "vided for him. But ministers value, we "trust, too highly the *unanimous voice* of "the people in support of this necessary "war, to hazard the *popularity* that has at- "tended its progress, by taking any im- "provident step that might give it a new "character, and disgust the country with "its further continuance. And here we "may be permitted to ask, does the situa- "tion of France, or of the Continent, af- "ford, at present, a more favourable pros- "pect for the restoration of the BOURBONS, "than at any other period since the war of "the revolution? Has this country to ex- "pect more powerful co operation in Eu- "rope, either for that purpose or for over- "throwing the revolutionary government "of France, than upon any former occa- "sion? Has she not, on the contrary, by "repeated acts, *salemnly recognized the* "*existence of a government in France, com-* "*petent to maintain relations of amity and* "*peace, and founded upon the known, ad-* "*mitted, and recognised exclusion of the* "*Bourbons from the throne of that country?* "The voice of almost the whole of Europe "now gives sanction to the present order of "things in France; and is this the moment "for us to depart from that policy, which "we have hitherto wisely acted upon, and "so frequently declared, namely, of not "interfering in the internal concerns of "France? Should we now, when we stand "singly opposed to the accumulated power "of the French ruler, proclaim by desert- "ing the real cause of Britain, and repair- "ing to the standard of the Bourbons, ano- "ther political crusade for the re establish- "ment of his family on the throne of "France? Are we *so enamoured of the* "*war*, that, rather than leave any open "for its termination, we should, by taking "such a step, *shut out all prospect of ac-* "*commodation*. If the measure could place "*us* in a better situation for prosecuting the "war, or produce any one solid or rational "advantage to the cause of the Bourbons, "there might be *some excuse for resorting* "*to it*. But as it would at best but gratify "idle feelings at the expence of substantial "interests, we, and we trust, every dis- "passionate man in the empire, must ap- "plaud the line of conduct which is un- "derstood to be adopted by ministers on "this delicate occasion.——This subject, "we regret to find, has been brought into "discussion rather inconsiderately. It was "to be wished, that time should have been "allowed to ascertain the accuracy of the "statements which have got into circula- "tion, before they had been made the "foundation of charges of inattention and "illiberality, unbecoming the relative si- "tuations of the respective parties. With- "out pretending to be in full possession "of all the circumstances of the case, "we know enough to warrant us in stat- "ing, that every duty of hospitality has been "performed, and every attention that the "character, in which the head of the house "of Bourbon ought to have presented him- "self on our shores, has been paid to him "by the government. Besides, it must be "remembered, *that the Count de Lisle ne-* "*ver was a king*, and that therefore to re- "cognise him as such, without any human "means of placing him upon a throne, "would only *widen our breach with France,* "*and exasperate the hostility of the two na-* "*tions*. We, too, can feel for the cala- "mities of an illustrious house; but we "must also feel for the *burthens* of our "countrymen; which would be greatly ag- "gravated by any proceeding that would "have the effect of *removing to a greater* "*distance all reasonable prospect of their* "*alleviation*. It is not quite certain either, "that the people of this country would con- "tinue so unanimous as they are at present, "if the setting up of Louis XVIII. should "give a new character to the war.—Would "there not also be just ground for the ene- "mies of government, if they be actuated "by any regular principle, to accuse them "of ingrafting foreign objects on a war of "truly British character? But these men, "in fact, do not seem to be guided by any "fixed or patriotic principle; for we find "those who were formerly so ready to "make every sacrifice to Bonaparte, now "join in the cry which has been attempted "to be raised against ministers, because "they refuse to alter the genuine character "of the contest, and to make it not the "war of Britain, but of the Bourbons, "whose pretensions to the crown of France "they have so long been in the habit of "holding up to public ridicule and scorn. "——We have not space at present to en- "large any further upon this subject; but "its high and vital importance will of "course induce us speedily to return to it.

" In the mean time we must generally ob-
" serve, that, in whatever point of view
" we consider the subject, whether as af-
" fecting our internal interests or our inter-
" nal unanimity, the immediate question
" of the nature and character of the war, or
" the real dignity of Louis XVIII, *we see*
" *enough to justify us in giving our entire*
" *approbation of the conduct of government,*
" *and expressing our unfeigned satisfaction*
" *that,* whilst they felt sincerely for the
" situation of the illustrious stranger, they
" very prudently governed their feelings by
" a consideration of the paramount duty
" which they owe to the British empire."
——Aye, that you do; quite enough you see in the instructions you have received to insert this article; and, if you were required to insert one of an exactly opposite tendency to-morrow, you would see " quite enough " to justify your approbation of an exactly opposite line of conduct on the part of " his " Majesty's confidential servants." But, my good hireling, you must not slip off so. Have you not, five hundred times, at least, during the last year, called the Emperor Napoleon an " *usurper?*" Have you not reproached and cursed, cruelly cursed, all those who have acknowledged him as the legitimate sovereign of France? And have you not, very recently, commended, in lofty strains, the conduct of the king of Sweden, who refused to give Napoleon any royal title at all? Nay, did you not commend the king of Sweden, for the resolution, which he was said to have taken, *of admitting Louis XVIII. into that country, and of openly recognising him as king of France?* To all these questions you, and all your brethren, the supporters of the ministers, must answer in the affirmative. Tell us, then, ye time-serving scribblers; tell us how Napoleon can be an " *usurper,*" if Louis be not *the king* of France.——You *now* have discovered, that we have, by repeated and solemn acts, recognised the legitimacy of Napoleon's authority. So we have; but, why, then, do you daily call him " a blood-stained usurper," and " a " monster whose life ought to pay the enor-
" mous forfeit of his crimes," as you did not more than ten days ago, while, at the same time, you call upon the people of France, to turn from this usurper to " their *lawful* and amiable *monarch?*" So we have, by repeated and solemn acts, recognised Napoleon as the legitimate ruler of France; but, so we had before aid and assistance was afforded to MEHÉ DE LA TOUCHE and his supposed associates; and, when it was made known to the world, that such aid had been given, a public paper, under the hand of Lord Hawkesbury, then as now, a Secretary of State, justified the act upon the express ground, that the government in France was an *usurpation,* and that we had a right to give encouragement and assistance to any part of the people of that country, who might be disposed to rise in arms against it. All this we did, after the " *repeated* " *and solemn acts of recognition,*" of which you speak, and which, now again, you have the impudence to make the ground of a refusal to recognize Louis as king of France. ——But, it seems now, that this the other-day *lawful* and amiable monarch " *never* " *was King of France.*" No? What was necessary to make him king? What more than the death of the lineal predecessor? Take care, thou loyal gentleman, or thou wilt call in question the right to reign of every king upon the face of the earth; for, according to your doctrine, upon this occasion, it is only possession that confers right. ——Your compassion, excited by the " *burdens*" of the people, and your anxiety to alleviate those burdens by peace, sound very well, particularly when compared with your language of only the other day, when you treated us with a description of the flourishing state of our finances, and abused the people of Sheffield for *talking of peace.* But, if you really have compassion for the people; if you really wish to lighten their burdens, why do you not propose to *diminish some of the expences of the state?* And, have not you, and all those by whom you are supported, constantly reviled every one who proposed such diminution?——No; the people would not be at all affected by a recognition of Louis XVIII. They now know of no precise object of the war. They know, that their country is in danger of being conquered; and, at present, they wish it not to be conquered; but, as to *objects* of the war, they know of none; nor have they ever known of any.——Not, observe, that I recommend the recognizing of Louis XVIII now. It is too late. If at all, it should have been done long ago. Nor, do I think, that the oversetting of Napoleon would do any good; while it might do a great deal of harm; for, if the former set of sovereigns were re-instated all over Europe, what, in God's name, would *the people* have to expect! His power, to be sure, is terrible; but, upon *some people,* that power has a salutary influence.——Louis XVIII. is, in my opinion, very right in refusing to live in Scotland. If suffered to come here at all, he ought to remain in England; and the support given him, *if any,* ought to be open

and liberal. But, unless he be recognized as king of France, I see no good reason for giving him any support at all out of the pockets, that is to say, out of the *labour* of the people of England. His Majesty has, we know, money in the funds; and, there is no one at all acquainted with the liberality and tender-heartedness of both their Majesties, that can, for a moment, doubt of their readiness to support, out of their private means, the charges necessary to maintain in comfort, and even in dignity, an unfortunate monarch, whose subjects have driven him to take refuge in their dominions. This is, in my humble opinion, the way in which all the unfortunate princes, and princesses, who take refuge here, should be supported. It would be the most dignified way; and, who will not believe, that it would be the way by far most agreeable to their Majesties? It is a compliment due to them, and one that ought by no means to be withheld; and, indeed, now that his Majesty has a set of confidential servants after his own heart, I think we may hope, that he will be gratified in what all must suppose to be his wish.——The Morning Post, from whom I have taken the above extract, observes, that our own royal family is so numerous, that we have, in England, no palace to spare for Louis XVIII. That is very true, or, at least, I believe so; and, there is no loyal subject who would wish to see either of his Majesty's illustrious sons put to any shifts or inconveniences for the sake of a stranger, and a Frenchman too. But, then, I really can see no objection to that stranger's going to London, though the Morning Post hopes "he will not be so *in-* "*discreet*." What does he mean by this? What indiscretion is there in going to London? London appears to me to be the place, to which he would naturally wish to go. The truth, is, when men are at a loss to know what to say, they must, and they will, talk nonsense. Of one thing there is, however, an end now; and that is, the calling Napoleon an *usurper*; for, if there be no legitimate sovereign in existence, out of France, the person who reigns there must be regarded as the legitimate sovereign. Our news-papers have, till now, it is true, called Louis XVIII "*king of France*;" but, now that he is come amongst us, they give him completely up; they say, that we have, by repeated and solemn acts, recognized the legitimacy of the authority of Napoleon, and that to recognize Louis as king of France, would be to perpetuate the war between the two nations, to no manner of purpose, except that of gratifying the whim of Louis and his few adherents. Very well. Here, then, we come to a point, to a settled rule of action; and, therefore, I say, let us hear no more of *usurpers*.——If any thing, from the pen of a party slave, could, at this day astonish us, it certainly would be, to see the *Morning Chronicle* recommending the recognition of Louis XVIII. as king of France. This is not ignorance; it is not a want of capacity to perceive, that such a step, at this time, would be downright raving madness; it is sheer party perverseness. The ministers, if they have done any thing in the matter, have, in my opinion, done too much; for, as to supporting the unfortunate prince here, out of the public money, when, if it begin, is it to *cease*? And, upon what principle is it, that the people of this country are to be obliged to support, every prince, friend or foe, who happens to be driven from his country? No. The whole matter ought to have been left to the king and the royal family. That would have been by far the most delicate mode of proceeding; and, as I said before, there can be no doubt, that it would have been the mode most agreeable to the feelings of the royal personages themselves. It appears to me, that a grant from the parliament would amount to little less than the recognition, which has been described to be replete with danger; and, therefore, again and again I express my hope, that his Majesty will take the matter into his own hands.

AMERICAN STATES.——The following article, in the form of a letter, addressed to the Editor of the Morning Chronicle, relative to our ministers in America, would have passed unnoticed by me; it would have been left to gratify the vanity, which it was intended to gratify, exciting in me merely a shrug of compassion, though not entirely unmixed with contempt; but, containing, as it does, a contrast between Mr. Erskine and our *former* ministers in America, greatly disadvantageous to those former ministers; and, what is more, containing a direct censure upon those former ministers, without any exception, I cannot let it pass, without that observation or two, which it loudly calls for. ——"Sir," says this pretended uninterested correspondent, "It affords me great plea- "sure that I have it in my power to send "you the enclosed extract of a pamphlet in "my possession, which I have received "from New York, entitled, "*The Voice* "*of Truth*; or, Thoughts on the Affair be- "tween the Leopard and the Chesapeake." "——The great respect I entertain for my "Lord Erskine, induces me to afford you "the means of gratifying the noble lord's "friends and the British public with the

" sentiments of respect and esteem which " are entertained in America for his son.— " " To demonstrate the sincere wish for " " harmony which influenced their minds, " " her ministers selected as their messen- " " ger a gentleman *calculated in every re-* " " *spect to win the regards,* and to extin- " " guish the prejudices, of all who were " " not wholly French. The son of the " " *Lord Chancellor of Britain,* of temper " " mild, in manner gentlemanly and con- " " ciliating—frank, *yet firm,* unassuming " " and *unostentatious,* though liberally " " maintaining the splendour of his rank; " " and though sufficiently dignified, whol- " " ly unsullied with official arrogance, and " " untainted with that *hauteur* which, in a " " great measure, shut *those who preceded* " " *him out of the hearts of the people,* and " " of course from an intimate knowledge " " of the country. The appointment of " " such a person ought to have been re- " " ceived by the American administration, " " as most *probably it was intended,* as a " " *compliment,* and as a proof, not a little " " satisfactory, that theywished to cultivate " " the friendship of America in sincerity." ——First, I should like to know, how much this article, this puff as rank as ever was inserted by pay-grinder or by medical quack; I should like to know, how much this article *cost* in fee to the Morning Chronicle. And, then I should like to know how much it cost in America. What a scandalous attempt at imposture, to give us this as an extract from an *American* pamphlet! as taken from a work, expressing *the sentiments of the people of America!* " Gratifying the British public with " the sentiments of respect and esteem, " which are entertained *in America* for Lord " Erskine's son!" Aye, in America, but, by *whom* there? By every body, as far as I *know* to the contrary. I have no positive *proof,* that all the people there are not enamoured of this late Lord Chancellor's son; but, *this pamphlet* is no proof at all of it. I know how pamphlets are written there. I know the sort of motives from which they are generally published: and, I have no scruple to say, that the passage above quoted, was written to produce effect in England, and not in America; in short, that it was made for the very purpose, to which it has now been so expeditiously applied.——Of Mr. Erskine's *fitness* for his post I will say nothing; because, perhaps, if I should " pain his feelings," either in the way of commission or of omission, he might " take the law of me," for which I have by no means any stomach. But, I will say, that, as far as the sentiments of the real Americans have reached me, they looked upon his appointment as *no compliment at all* paid to their country. It is fine talking of the " Honourable Mr. Erskine, " son of the Lord High Chancellor of Bri- " tain," but, only a few months before, the Americans saw him in their country, in a very different capacity; they were well acquainted with the circumstances of his marriage, and of his taking to *the bar* after he returned to England; and, stupid as some persons may suppose them, they know all about the making of Lords and Lord Chancellors, and about appointing ambassadors, in England.——Of his fitness for the post he is in we shall be able to judge, when we come to see his official papers; but, I venture to say, that, in no one respect, would his *father,* if he had been in the son's place, have shown greater talent and address than were by Mr. Hammond in one way, and by Mr. Liston in another. They did not, to be sure, herd with mercantile agents and land-jobbers, without discrimination. They were not speculators, either in lands or funds themselves, and, therefore, had little temptation to associate and smoke segars and get drunk with that description of persons, which, in America, is the most vile upon earth. But, to accuse them of *haughtiness* is false and malignant. There is not the slightest foundation for the charge. Both of them are modest, unassuming men; both of them easy of access, affable and kind; both of them men of great talents, and not less zeal in the service of their country: and, the day will yet come when we shall be able to ascertain, from sources more authentic than a New York pamphlet, how Mr. Erskine stands in comparison with them.

Everley, 5th Nov. 1807.

EDINBURGH REVIEWERS.

Southampton, Oct. 27, 1807.

SIR,——I was directed by your Register of last week, to a perusal of the critique of your writings by the Edinburgh Reviewers; and, as I have seen no attempt to vindicate the good sense of our ancestors from their calumnies, or to protect the admirable construction of our constitution from their *improvements*; I shall, with many conscious apprehensions of insufficiency, attempt it myself.—I lightly pass over their exordium, (an attack altogether personal upon you,) both because your own apology for your change of opinions is in the hands of the public, and, because I hold such imputed change in your opinions to be wholly irrelevant to

the great questions, which you have brought before the country. Had you changed your opinions ninety-nine times, those changes would leave the questions of the violation of the provisions of the Bill of Rights, and of the Act of Settlement, in regard to triennial parliaments—to Placemen sitting in the House of Commons—misapplication of public Money—undue influence at elections, bribery, &c. the appreciation of Mr. Pitt's administration, &c. exactly, as these matters would have stood without the imputed changes in your opinions; QUESTIONS OF FACT, in which, the government and the people are at issue; questions no more to be altered by the alledged alterations in Mr. Cobbett's opinions, than to be answered by the metaphysical theorems of the Edinburgh Reviewers.—Upon the grounds of their personal attack, I will only observe, before I dismiss it, that the man, who imposes on himself the weekly task of discussing all public questions as they arise, is more obnoxious to the formation of a hasty opinion, than other men; that, there appears no satisfactory cause, why a person should be debarred of the benefit of second thoughts in politics, more than in other affairs; and, that I can see no reason, when the subjects of our political contemplation completely revolve, why human opinion upon them should stand still; lastly, a change *for the better*, (which is Mr. Cobbett's case), can on no occasion fail to be a good thing. There is one species of change, indeed, for which nothing ever can, or ought to be said. I mean a change attended by a selfish remuneration of any kind. But as this is not imputed to Mr. Cobbett, it forms no part of the present discussion.—I proceed to the sentiments of the Reviewers themselves, (page 407, vol. 20) which, however, cannot be properly followed *seriatim*; inasmuch as some of their positions are controverted by their own subsequent remarks; and to bring these together, the order of their argument may require to be interrupted. In the outset I must seriously on my most solemn veracity assure such of my readers as may not have access to the volume, that in a critical work of celebrated wit and great authority, patronized by some of the leaders of the Whig party in the 19th century, the following positions, however incredible it may appear, are distinctly laid down; their expressions being merely by me divested of their verbiage. (page 407, vol. 20. Edinb. Review) 1st. That it is for the good of the people of England, [and of course more good for the people of Scotland] that *placemen* should sit in the House of Commons!—2d. That the exerted influence of peers, and other great patrons, in the election of members of parliament is also good!—Lastly, that the *rotten boroughs* induce no hazard to the constitution, and do not require *reform*. In short, are good also. In a word, they saw it all, and it was good!—The Spaniards have a popular proverb in describing a man, who is very very good; and of such a one they say, "*é tanto buon, che val niente*;" being in vulgar English, "he is so good, that he is "good for nothing." Whether our critics had this in their eye or not, I will not vouch; but, it is certain, that *in the same paragraph* they do admit, "that the sale of bo-"roughs is dishonourable to both the par-"ties concerned in it," and in page 421 of the same critique, they do admit, that "there is a very general spirit of discon-"tent, distrust, and contempt for public "characters" (by which must be meant members of the legislature) "amongst the "more intelligent, &c. &c. of the people." "That they see the seeds of a *revolution* in "the present aspect and temper of the na-"tion." That they "are afraid in the "event of any great emergency or disaster, "no reasonings and no motives of prudence "will be sufficient to uphold the established "forms of the constitution, unless some ef-"fort be made on the part of *public men*" [certainly members of parliament!!] "to "wipe off the imputations which are now "thrown upon their characters."!!! This is their own character of our *excellent* legislature. Observe, it is not of *individuals*, that these portraits are, or can be drawn; for it is not to the evil influence of the political misconduct of individuals, or even of a mere minority of the legislature, that such results—that such prognostics can apply. If, "there is a very general spirit of *discontent*, "distrust, and contempt of public charac-"ters, amongst the more intelligent part of "the nation," what has excited "*gene-*"*ral discontent*," but BAD GOVERNMENT? What has excited the spirit of "general dis-"trust of public characters," unless, that after experiment upon all factions in the legislature, all have proved unworthy of trust? And, what can have excited "general *con-*"*tempt* for public characters," but their universal baseness? Again, if "they descry "the seeds of *revolution* in the present as-"pect and temper of the nation," to what does the nation owe its actual temper and aspect? Is it to its GOOD *government!* Or is it the satisfaction of the people in the conduct of its representatives, which has sown "these *seeds?*" Lastly, "if the imputa-"tions thrown upon the characters of pub-

" lic men, will in any disaster or emergency " compromise the safety of the constitu- " tion," to what are " these *imputations*" to be ascribed, but to the examples exhibited by these " public men!!"—If the public characters, who are capable of doing, who do and *will do*, all this national mischief, are *not* members of parliament, will the Edinburgh Reviewers tell us, who they are, whom they allude to? If they *are* members of parliament, will they tell us how such men as they (not I) represent them to be, became entrusted with the interests of the community? And, if " *places*," " *undue* " *influence*," and " *rotten boroughs*" did not introduce such personages into our legislature, will the Edinburgh Reviewers have the goodness to tell us who, or what did introduce them? In the mean time, I will tell the Reviewers, that had Mr. Cobbett written, with " his usual scurrility," that our late representatives had one day voted, *that white was white*, and the next day (in order to serve their mercenary ends) had voted, *that it was black*, he would not have held their proceedings and their characters up to so much execration, as they have been by the Edinburgh Reviewers in their defence; exemplifying the truth of a remark of Junius, although itself a solecism, " that a " man may be the bitterest enemy of his " friend."—I next proceed to their elementary consideration of the persons, of whom a parliament, *in their opinion*, ought to be composed, with a view to the functions, which it has to perform. (page 407) And herein, entirely departing from the liberal theory of our constitution, in vain illustrated by Blackstone, and eulogized by De Lolme, these Reviewers or Libellers lay down, that the most " *perfect representation of the* " *people*" must be " that which reunites " in itself the greatest proportion of the " *effective aristocracy* of the country."— " That the nation is ultimately governed by " the same individuals, who in their sepa " rate capacities, would have directed the " sentiments of a very large majority" of the people, " and it being evident that rank, " fortune, and official situation being " amongst the most powerful of the means " by which men are enabled individually to " influence the opinions and conduct of " those around them," " therefore, rank, " wealth, and office should make the great- " est number (that is, a *decided majority*) of " its legislators," (meaning its members of the House of Commons; no other branch of the legislature being in question). In other words, that the people should not be represented *effectively* at all. For, of what good to the people can be the representatives of the people convoked in an assembly with the representatives of rank, wealth, and office, which have (by the supposition) a decided majority over them? In the rationale of these Reviewers however, as in the order of Providence, *good* arises out of *evil*, (at least what Blackstone would have anathematized as such, though they regard it *as good*) for they having discovered that " the constitu- " tional use of a House of Commons was to " preserve the freedom of the people," (page 408) and, it moreover, appearing from their oracles, that this is best to be done by making speeches, whereby the attention of the people is called perpetually to their public rights and interests, their intelligence sharpened, and their spirit exercised and excited; and, it being moreover discovered, that a House of Commons principally composed of the proxies of peers and of representatives of the aristocracy, and of placemen, can make speeches of adequate length upon any given subject, which can interest the people; *ergo*, the people's rights will be as well secured to them by representatives, who *do not* represent them, as by representatives who *do*! " Since, after all, it is on the spi- " rit and intelligence of the people them- " selves, that their liberties must always ul- " timately depend;" and these it has been already clearly proved " *depend ultimately*" upon the speeches, which are to be made in the House of Commons *(chosen as above)* and by no means, as has been vulgarly supposed, upon the honour, courage, good sense and identity in interests of the persons, whom, in a free and popular choice, they might send to represent them. Their next assumption, and which I beg by no means to dispute, is, that our House of Commons is actually composed of such persons, as, agreeably to their ingenious hypothesis, it ought to be composed. How provoking then must be the obstinacy and stupidity of the people to these good Reviewers, who, having selected for their confidence, and for the preservation of their rights and liberties, such materials for a House of Commons out of the aristocracy and placemen, as ought to be selected; and in such proportion, with the scanty and profane materials sent by the people, as ought to be observed; having moreover enriched them with the attributes of making speeches, such as ought to be made; speeches, which would have driven Verres despairing out of Rome, or have excited Athens to a man to rise and march against Philip: how provoking, I say, after this banquet of liberty given by the Reviewers, must be the obstinacy and stupidity of the

people! Who, in the very teeth of "rank, "wealth, and office," which fill the House of Commons, and which, it is proved by the Reviewers, ought to fill it; which "rank, "wealth, and office," "enable men indivi- "dually to influence the opinions and con- "duct of those around them:" How provoking, I repeat, must it be to the Edinburgh Reviewers, who have shewn "that it" naturally "follows that these qualifications, "rank, wealth, and office," should have "their due share in returning members of "the legislature; and that the government "could not otherwise (page 408) be either "stable, or respectable." I say, how extremely provoking must it be to these Edinburgh Reviewers, to be obliged themselves to admit in this very same critique "that the "sale of Boroughs is *dishonourable* to both "the parties concerned in it;" and, what in their estimation, is probably a great deal worse than dishonour, as it is a great deal worse for their argument, "that there is a "very *general* spirit of *discontent*, *distrust*, "and *contempt* for public characters amongst "the MORE INTELLIGENT, &c. &c. of the "people;" "that *they see* the seeds of a "*revolution* in the present aspect and tem- "per of the nation; that they are afraid "in the event of any great emergency or "disaster, NO REASONINGS, (I presume they "mean such as *their own)* and *no motives* "*of prudence will be sufficient to uphold the* "*established forms* of the constitution," (this is what every body thinks) "unless "some effort be made on the part of public "men to wipe off the imputations which are "now thrown upon their characters!!!" I ask you, Mr. Cobbett, how this could have happened? For, it is in vain to ask the Edinburgh Reviewers; who have, in one and the same sheet of paper, *admitted*, both that *it has* happened, and *proved*, that it *cannot happen!* But, I pause, Sir—an apology is due to your readers for an attempt, however brief and playful, at refuting, what refutes itself. But as, whatever may be the patience of the reader, the Reviewer's critique is not yet half exhausted, and as the whole of *their developement* of the rationale of our constitution is a gross libel upon its genius, as well as an insult upon those, who venerate its genuine spirit, and who wish to restore it to that spirit, I will devote another day in one of your next Registers *to the duty* of further exploding the doctrine of the promulgators of A NEW CONSTITUTION, which admits by its very principles "DISHONOUR" in its origin, and in its operation, is a practical abandonment on the part of the people of their own most valuable property—their hereditary rights and liberties.——I am, Sir, yours,——JOHN COTTON WORTHINGTON.

EAST-INDIES.

SIR;——I have observed it is seldom you advert to the affairs of the East-Indies, and that when you do so, it is with an apparent reluctance, as to a subject painful to you. Yet, if you could sometimes bring yourself to bestow a few hours and a page or two on that quarter of the world, it presents a field in which your exertions might not be without avail for the honor, if not the interests, of our country, and in the cause of humanity. This without entering into the depths of its motley policies, but only occasionally striking at some of the most glaring features of its management under the British rule. At present it is my hope, through your means, to obtain the timely attention of the Directors of the Company to what, from obvious reasons, may not have been very fully officially detailed to them; the alarming Desertions, that since the unfortunate catastrophe at Vellore, have extended themselves throughout the whole Madras Native Army; threatening its speedy annihilation, if some more effectual measures are not adopted, towards doing away the present discontents, than any yet resorted to by the local government. —The impossibility of the subjection and defence of a territory equal in extent to the half of Europe, and of a population exceeding fifty millions, by any military force from England, must be self-evident. It would be a waste of the patience of every one acquainted with India, to attempt to shew, at any length, how our dominion over it is dependant on the arms and loyalty of its native troops; or to dwell on the like eventual fatal result to our power, whether we drive them to a state of general open mutiny, or they have recourse, in disgust, to the more quiet, but not less destructive operation of desertion. Nor can it be necessary to expatiate on the policy of a consideration of their national and religious habits, that by avoiding what may disgust them, and attending to what may please them, we may render them satisfied with their situations in the British service, and attach them to the British interests.—The public are already acquainted, that the late lamentable occurrence at Vellore arose out of an endeavour to expunge from the forehead of the Pagan soldier the distinguishing mark of his faith, to clip the Mahomedan's whiskers, and to force upon the heads of the whole some fancy cap, in the room of the turban. But this has been by no means the first mark of dissatisfaction from similar measures. Twen-

ty years since, a regiment of cavalry mutinied at Arnee, rather than receive the helmet. About ten years since a Rajpoot destroyed himself upon the parade of Tiagar, in consequence of pollution at drill. But the detail of mutinies and executions or other punishments is a painful task, and unnecessary to my purpose. The experience of every Madras officer will sufficiently confirm one general statement, that for some time back, scarcely any year has passed, in which, in some corps or other, strong discontent has not been evinced, in consequence of an interference with their habits and customs; and this often in points enjoined by their religious persuasions. Intimately so, are the painted forehead denoting at once the sect of the individual and the performance of his morning ablutions; and the whiskers and manner of shaving marking religious fasts and private mournings. Such also is the Asiatic predilection for the turban in opposition to the European hat or cap, that it is impossible to pass along the streets of any town without hearing the very children, in their terms of abuse to each other, use that of Hat-fellow, as one of the most stigmatizing.—The investigation of the cause of evil is commonly the first step towards its remedy, and in this view, I have been led to the present endeavor to trace out the sources of the great change that has taken place, in the sentiments of the Sepoys towards the English service, with deference, however, to my brother officers, from whom I hope support, by giving publicity to their opinions. In the days of Sir Eyre Coote, although the European troops were regularly paid, the whole native army was from six months to three years in arrears, in distress borrowing at usury, and some even selling their children into slavery, for a subsistence; yet was every proffer from Hyder indignantly repelled by them; and under every hardship of warfare desertion almost unknown. It may not be credited, but so it was, and I appeal to Sir Hippesly Cox, then one of the paymasters, to verify the fact. On the making peace, a considerable reduction of the army took place, and these men were paid their arrears in paper, which when they presented at the pay offices, they were told there was no money: the pay-master's clerks and servants, however, offering to buy this paper of them, at 75 per cent. discount, or, perhaps, the amount of a month or six weeks pay, for that of the whole three years. The poor fellows had no alternative, but to take what was tendered to them. Stung by such rank injustice, and to escape their debts, the greater part of them resorted to Tippoo's dominions, and to his service for their future bread. It was neither renegado Frenchmen, ever mistrusted; nor the idler tale of Hyder's own acquired experience in a French camp: it was these brave faithful ill-treated soldiers, who carried with them into the ranks of the Mysore army that discipline and knowledge of war, to repress which ultimately compelled the Company to double their military establishment at Madras; and has called forth those arduous and repeated exertions, for the expenses of which they are actually so many millions in debt; and what is worse, has cost the lives of so many thousands of British soldiers, and of so many tens of thousands of Sepoys.—In the face of experience are we to imagine these veterans, driven to desertion by our persecutions, are not at the present day anxiously sought by every power of the country; and that the warmth of reception shewed to the forerunners will not create such a general excitement, that every day's delay in the application of the sufficient remedy must be an extinguisher to the very hope of any arrest to this disastrous turn, which our own follies have set in motion? To what quarters are these veterans now transporting their arms and their experience? In the camps of Scindia and Holkar, will they not be received with open arms? Among the numerous Jageerdars by whom our territories are surrounded, may no new Hyder appear? What additional strength to the disaffected Poligars of the western hills, through an exposed extent of coast reaching from Cochin to Mangalore! What follows for the service of our most inveterate enemy, whenever he shall be able to obtain a footing in these distant regions!—The unfortunate regulations, which created so sad a resistance, are now explained to have been drawn up by an officer of the Company's European Regiment, and who never served in any native battalion; but, being on the staff of head quarters, had access to the commander-in-chief; and vaguely sanctioned by two other staff officers, long since removed by their situation from immediate intercourse with only native troops, were hastily adopted, not only without consulting any of the officers commanding the battalions, but even in opposition to the remonstrances of some of them, when ordered to carry the code into effect.—By late accounts from Madras we learn that this spirit of desertion is no longer confined to the infantry, but that since the appointment of Lieut. Col. Gillespie, of His Majesty's Nineteenth Dragoons,

to superintend the discipline of the native cavalry, it has also extended itself to this branch of the army.—When we consider the whole affair of Vellore, the circumstances in which it originated, and the part which it fell to the lot of Lieut. Col. Gillespie to have to perform, I think it might have been apprehended, that he would not prove the officer, whose interference would be the most acceptable to any branch of the native army, in the regulations of their details; and to whose opinions they might be most cheerfully brought to yield any peculiar usages, if necessary to be exacted from them. And it appears further strange, when we call to mind the hitherto pre-eminent discipline of the Madras Native Cavalry, and the acknowledged professional skill of its proper officers, that there should have existed any necessity to pass by them; and to call in an officer from another service, junior in rank to some, and in practical professional experience to many of them.—Let me now ask on what grounds it can be inferred, that an officer fresh from Europe, without a knowledge of the language of the country; or if any time resident in India, his attention absorbed by the duties of his European Regiment, or staff employ; and consequently without the equal opportunity of observing, should equally understand with their own officers, whose lives are passed in the midst of them, those religious tenets by which the constant demeanor of the natives, Mahomedan and Pagan, is influenced; and be in the same manner aware of the variety of their sects, the difference of their superstitious forms and ceremonies, and the intricate amities and hostilities by which they are actuated towards each other: or may it not be more rationally expected, that with European hauteur looking down contemptuously on prejudices and principles he does not comprehend, he should convert to grounds of dissatisfaction, what constitutes in the hands of their own officers, the best assurance of the fidelity of the Indian soldiery?—I have now candidly exposed what, as well from my own observations, as from communications with some of its oldest and most resspectable officers, I do conscientiously believe to be the genuine sources of the present state of the Madras Native Army, inspiring such just apprehension. If the voice of an individual should reach those who rule over the affairs of India, it earnestly calls on them to weigh the policy of confiding the superintendency of the native troops to their own officers, practised in their usages; with the responsibility, vesting also an authority, under the commander-in-chief, in the respective senior officers of infantry and cavalry, each in his own branch, in all matters of its internal economy; and restricting, by so precise an arrangement as shall admit no pretence from commanding forts or detachments, or in any other way, for an interference in the subordinate degrees of either of its departments by the officers of the other, or by the officers of his Majesty's service: whether in respect to the detail of discipline or the personal appearance of the men; or the delicate attentions necessary to their peculiar habits and family arrangements, religious ceremonies, feasts and fasts, holidays and processions and other private occurrences.—In this manner not refusing the influence of that personal love and confidence, began in youth and strengthened by years, from the Sepoys towards their own officers, under a long participation of the same toils; nor slackening the bonds of their authority, by degrading and lowering them to a secondary class; but giving to the proper officers of the native troops a reasonable chance, if not too late, that under the control and guidance of their seniors, and by such a course as their discernment and judgment, formed on a long local experience, shall suggest, they may avert from the Company and themseves the threatfining dangers of the present awful period, and save a fine army to the services of their country.——A MADRAS OFFICER.——*Oct.* 11, 1807.

EXPATRIATION.

SIR,——My attention having been principally directed to the remarks of Candidus, and to your observations upon the subject of my communication, the animadversions of your correspondent R. R. (569) had escaped my notice until this day, which I had devoted to a perusal of the favours of your other correspondents. While I with R. R. condemn "personalities and invectives," I cannot with him agree, that "vice to be despised and abhorred is necessary only to be seen;" that superabundant portion of self denial, that more than usual share of reason which R. R. may possess, may cause him to controul his passions, and detest not only the sight of vice, but forcibly condemn it in others; while, however, he happily possesses the rigid stoicism of men who never have been in the way of temptation, he should not condemn an unfortunate wretch as he represents me, who possibly may be as free from vice actually, as R. R. may pretend to be, but who have also withstood the temptation never perhaps thrown

in his way. I arrogate not to myself a stoicism superior to R. R. I advocate not the cause of vice; but, I think R. R. did not act with his wonted profundity, when he declined commenting upon the doctrine I have advanced, howsoever 'indignant' his feelings and strong his "personal invectives" may be. But should R. R.'s "indignant" feelings continue, and he should be as well able as he probably may be disposed to enlarge upon the 'extravagant and ridiculous' doctrine I have broached. I now furnish him with a further observation, on which he may employ a portion of his invaluable time. But, I must request R. R. before he hastily and inconsiderately replies to the absurdity of my doctrine, and howsoever 'extravagant and ridiculous' he may at present deem it to be, to consult the authorities I have referred to, as well as duly consider my observations; although the latter may not lead him on to conviction, they may possibly induce him in future to suspend a hasty and inconsiderate decision, and teach him not to condemn as 'ridiculous and extravagant' a doctrine countenanced, and ably maintained by writers much more able than either R. R. or S. V., and possibly, not comprehended by either of them.——The Proclamation, Mr. Cobbett, (and to this and to my observations upon it, R. R. may attend, if his inclination and ability enable him to animadvert again by way of episode) which appeared in the Gazette of 17th October, fully accords with my ideas expressed in my last letter, with respect to the right of the executive to prevent expatriation on an emergency. It is not for me, Sir, as a subject of this kingdom, to doubt the power of the executive to declare, or the legislature to legislate on this or other subjects; but, I may without a liability to the charge of inconsistency shew, that while foreign states are labouring to weaken our maritime power, by enticing our seamen to desert their country's cause, we do really adopt the self same thing we so much condemn in others. I have before declared that I advocate the cause of consistency, and I will continue so to do as long as you permit me, notwithstanding I may have the 'full sealed quart measure of reprobation' from Candidus, 'for publicly asserting my principles,' and, although R. R. despises and abhors' my doctrine. When we advance stubborn facts, Mr. Cobbett, we need not the aid of violent expression; and Candidus and R. R. should know, that though their strength of nerve, entrenched as they may both be with the lusty sinews of draymen, may qualify them for the gymnastic line, that when they chuse to enter into disputation, something more is necessary than the powers of muscular strength and Stentorian violence; some little shew of argument should accompany mere assertion; for, though I might perhaps, from my diminutive stature, a mere sesquipedalian as I am, succumb under their Herculean fist, yet neither their Stentorian voices nor Ciceronian expression, without argument tending to conviction can stifle me. I am not to be dragooned into conviction; if your correspondents will adopt rather more of the argumentative than the dogmatical stile, it will be more beneficial to them, as it may to me, for I shall not pay much attention to a man's doctrine, whether diametrically opposite to mine or in favour of it, unless he chuses to assign a stronger ground in support of it, than because it may suit him to say such is my doctrine, because so it is—*ita lex scripta est*, may do in the mouths of men of authority, but when adopted by anonymous correspondents it must be accompanied by argument, for from argument conviction must result.—The first section of the proclamation "for recalling and prohibiting seamen from "serving foreign princes and states," sets out with stating, that "seafaring men, na- "tural born subjects, have been enticed to "enter into foreign states;" and, the 5th section declares, that "they have been in- "duced to accept letters of naturalization, "or certificates of citizenship from foreign "states, and have been taught to believe, "that by such letters or certificates, they "are discharged from that duty of alle- "giance which, as our natural born subjects "they owe to us;" and then it *declares*, that "no such letters or certificates can di- "vest our natural born subjects of alle- "giance."—I do not find fault with this proclamation; it accords with my ideas; the right to restrain the subjects of this country being founded on a state of necessity; but, I condemn the want of consistency, as it appears to me there is, between this proclamation and the statute law of the country.——By the 13 George 2. chap. 3. sec. 2, "for the better encouraging of *foreign* ma- "riners and *seamen*, to come and serve on "board ships belonging to this Kingdom of "Great Britain, be it further enacted, by the "authority aforesaid, that every such fo- "reign mariner or seaman who shall from "and after the 1st day of January, 1739, "have faithfully served during the time of "war, on board any of his Majesty's ships "of war, or any merchant or other trading "ship or ships, vessel or vessels, or priva- "teers (which at the time of such service "shall belong to any of his Majesty's sub- "jects of Great Britain) for the space of "*two years*, shall to all intents and purposes

" be deemed and taken to be *a natural born* " *subject* of his Majesty's Kingdom of Great " Britain, and have and enjoy all the privi- " leges, powers, rights, and capacities, " which such foreign mariner or seaman " could, should, or ought to have had and " enjoyed, in case he had been a natural " born subject of his Majesty, and actually " a native within the Kingdom of Great " Britain."—Now, what I have heretofore contended for, and do now contend is, that we ought not to permit and invite foreigners to become naturalized, unless we allow other powers from whom we take their subjects, to decoy our subjects from us in a similar way to that which under the above statute we have the power of doing. Would it not be well to repeal on the first meeting of parliament, the above-mentioned section 2d?—We then can properly insist upon the propriety of recalling our subjects who may have attempted to depart from their allegiance; but, so long as this section remains in force in our written code, I do hold it to be inconsistent and impolitic, that we should condemn a foreign state for doing that which we sanction with respect to his subjects.——S. V.——*Oct.* 20, 1807.

DOMESTIC OFFICIAL PAPER.

Authentic Copy of the Letter addressed by Lieut. Gen. Lord Cathcart, to Major Gen. Peymann, the Commandant of Copenhagen, previous to the commencement of the siege of that City, dated Head Quarters, Aug. 20, 1807.

Sir,——Your letter of the 18th, did not come into my hands till late last night. The passport for Prince Frederick Ferdinand, with his retinue, is given on the same principle with those which have already been sent, but it must be strictly limited to the persons described. An irregularity is reported to me to have occurred on the part of the bearer of your letter. It will be of reciprocal convenience that such circumstances should not occur. Every mark of respectful attention having been paid to the illustrious persons related to the Blood Royal of Denmark, and due regard having been shewn to the household and equipage of his Danish Majesty, circumstances imperiously demand that a stop must now be put to the departure of any person whatever from the metropolis. In making this communication, I cannot refrain from availing myself of this opportunity of representing, in my own name, as well as in that of the admiral commanding his Majesty's fleet, to the most serious consideration of your Excellency, the existing state of affairs at Copenhagen, which are drawing to an awful crisis. If this city, the capital of Denmark, the residence of the King, and of his royal court and government, the seat of learning, and the rendezvous of commerce, full of inhabitants of all ranks, ages, and sexes, will put itself on the footing of a fortress besieged, it must be attacked by all the means which may appear best calculated for its reduction, as soon as orders are given to that purpose; and, when such is the case, the officers employed have no choice but to use every effort to take the place. The attack of a city so rich and populous, cannot fail to be attended by consequences most destructive in preparation, as well as in final execution, to the persons and property of individuals. Impelled by the necessity of the case, our government has at the same time supplied positive orders and ample means to attack by sea and land, in case of refusal on the part of Denmark to treat in an amicable manner.—The preparations are perhaps in a more forward state than you imagine. For God's sake, Sir, let it be calmly considered, whether resistance may not lead to the destruction of the very treasure you wish to preserve, and whether under the circumstances of the present dispute the praise of displaying the valour for which every body is prepared to give you credit, will compensate the ruin and destruction inseparable from the siege of a capital city; and the ultimate loss or destruction of your fleet and arsenal, which might be avoided.——Property of every kind without the walls has been respected; you must know likewise that other objects, and of the greatest national importance to the power of Denmark are within my grasp, and have remained hitherto unremoved. This is a state of things which cannot continue. I mean not to offend you by any thing like a menace, but I exhort your Excellency and your Council to think seriously of the irreparable loss which the operation of a few days may occasion, but which might still be averted.—I have the honour to be, with the greatest personal consideration, Sir, your Excellency's most obedient humble servant,

(Signed) Cathcart, Lieut. Gen.

The Ninth Volume of Cobbett's Parliamentary Debates, comprising the period from the 5th of March to the close of the First Session of the Fourth Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, to the 14th of August, 1807, is ready for delivery.

Printed by Cox and Baylis, No. 75, Great Queen Street, and published by R. Bagshaw, Brydges Street, Covent Garden, where former Numbers may be had; sold also by J. Budd, Crown and Mitre, Pall-Mall.